



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/587,474

06/06/2007

Edwin Wilhelmus Van Der Sanden

078986-0224

9210

23392

7590

04/16/2010

FOLEY & LARDNER

555 South Flower Street

SUITE 3500

LOS ANGELES, CA 90071-2411

EXAMINER

HASSAN, RASHEDUL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2179

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/16/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/587,474	Applicant(s) VAN DER SANDEN ET AL.	
	Examiner RASHEDUL HASSAN	Art Unit 2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 August 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-129 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-129 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02 August 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>08/02/2006</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claims 2, 49, 50, 102, 104 and 114 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 2 recites the limitation “provided the” in line 2. It should be corrected to recite “provided by the”.

Claim 50 recites the limitation “provided the” in line 7. It should be corrected to recite “provided by the”.

Claim 102 recites the limitation “is response to” in line 4. It should be corrected to recite “in response to”.

Claim 114 recites the limitation “message is response to” in line 4. It should be corrected to recite “in response to”.

Claims 49 and 104 have been amended by the Preliminary Amendment filed on 08/02/2006. However, the status indicators for these claims erroneously say “Original” instead of “Currently Amended”.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 48, 50-81, 96, 103, 105-109, and 119-128 are rejected under 35 USC § 101 for being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 48, 103 and 128 are directed to "a data carrier carrying computer program code". The term "data carrier" can reasonably be interpreted, in the broadest reasonable interpretation, to encompass a signal or carrier wave within its scope, which is not statutory subject matter.

Claims 50-79 are directed to an "Apparatus" which is claimed using means plus function language and thus raising the rebuttable presumption that Applicants intend to invoke 35 USC § 112, sixth paragraph. As such, the claims have been interpreted to invoke 35 USC § 112, sixth paragraph. In light of the specification, the "means" recited in these claims can be interpreted as nothing more than software only. See page 3 last paragraph, and throughout the instant specification. As such the apparatus claimed can be reasonably interpreted as software apparatus without any hardware being positively recited in these claims. Since software alone is not considered to be statutory subject matter, these claims are rejected for being directed to non-statutory subject matter, according to the broadest reasonable interpretation, under the meaning of 35 USC § 101.

Claims 96, 105-109, and 119-127 are rejected for being directed to non-statutory subject matter under similar rationale as discussed above in the rejection of claims 50-79 under 35 USC § 101. The Examiner interprets the limitation "storage means" as recited in claims 96 and 119 as a hierarchical software structure for storing

Art Unit: 2179

information, like a hierarchical tree or database tables, and not necessarily reciting a hardware component based on the broadest reasonable interpretation.

Claims 80-81 are directed to a "Server" comprising "a processor". In the broadest reasonable interpretation, the term "server" can be interpreted to refer to a "server application" which is nothing more than software only, and the term "processor" can reasonably be interpreted as a software module that performs some processing. The "term" processor does not necessarily refer to a "micro-processor" which is a hardware component. Therefore, the claims recite nothing more than "software" and therefore rejected as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-97, 110, 114, 119, 123, 128-129 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kusterer et al. (US 2005/0076311A1) hereinafter Kusterer.

For claim 1, Kusterer teaches **a method of configuring a server** (e.g., portal 320 as shown in Fig. 3, also see [0039] and [0042]) **to provide at least one composite user interface to at least one source application, the composite user interface comprising a plurality of user interface elements provided by said at least one source application** (e.g., see 325 in Fig. 3 and also portal 320 provides an interface including a unified navigation area based on unified navigation hierarchy created from combining individual navigation hierarchies of user interface elements from multiple source applications, see Abstract, 140 in Fig. 1, [0004], [0006], [0007]), **the method comprising, processing a model representing said composite user interface** (e.g., processing the navigation object model, see [0006], [0007], [0009], [0024], and [0026]) **to generate rules for communication between said composite user interface and said at least one source application** (see communicating with multiple application as mentioned in [0006], [0007], [0009], [0024], and [0026]. Such communication apparently involves generating rules for such communication).

Claims 48 (a data carrier), 49 (a computer apparatus), and 80 (a server) are directed to the same invention of claim 1 in different form (i.e., subject matter). Therefore, these claims are also rejected under similar rationale as claim 1.

For claim 2, Kusterer further teaches **a method according to claim 1, wherein said model comprises a model of at least part of a user interface provided by the**

or each source application and a model of relationships between the at least part of the user interface provided the or each source application and the composite user interface (e.g., see Fig. 6, also see [0055] to [0057]).

Claim 81 is also rejected under the same rationale as claim 2 discussed hereinabove.

For claim 3, Kusterer further teaches ***a method according to claim 1, further comprising:***

storing said rules within a hierarchical data structure comprising a plurality of entities (e.g., see the hierarchical structure mentioned in [0021], [0052], and [0053], also see Fig. 6, [0055] to [0057], Fig. 7 and [0059]).

Claim 82 is also rejected under the same rationale as claim 3 discussed hereinabove.

For claim 4, Kusterer further teaches ***a method according to claim 3, further comprising: storing within said hierarchical data structure an entity representing the composite user interface*** (e.g., the root node of the united navigation hierarchy,

Art Unit: 2179

see also [0030], [0033]); **and associating with said entity a data group providing configuration data for the composite user interface** (e.g., associating configuration data in [0027], also role based configuration in [0005], [0010], [0037], and [0040]).

Claim 83 is also rejected under the same rationale as claim 4 discussed hereinabove.

For claim 5, Kusterer further teaches **a method according to claim 4, further comprising: storing within said hierarchical data structure a plurality of service entities representing processing modules which are together adapted to process user requests input to said composite user interface to produce one or more requests to at least one source application** (e.g., see nodes used to launch application units. See [0059]. Additionally, or in the alternative the interfaces can be interpreted as such service entities. See [0033]).

Claim 84 is also rejected under the same rationale as claim 5 discussed hereinabove.

For claim 6, Kusterer further teaches ***a method according to claim 5, wherein at least some of said service entities have an associated data group storing configuration data*** (e.g., properties of the node objects implicit in the reference).

Claim 85 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 6 discussed hereinabove.

For claim 7, Kusterer further teaches ***a method according to claim 6, wherein one of said service entities is an aggregation service entity representing an aggregation service configured to generate source application requests from a user request*** (e.g., see the navigation service as discussed in [0024]).

Claim 86 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 7 discussed hereinabove.

For claim 8, Kusterer further teaches ***a method according to claim 7, wherein said aggregation service entity comprises: a child entity representing the composite user interface; and said child entity has at least one child entity representing a source application*** (see Fig. 6 and Fig. 7).

Claim 87 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 8 discussed hereinabove.

For claim 9, Kusterer further teaches ***a method according to claim 3, wherein said rules are generated using a plurality of writers each writer being associated with an entity in said hierarchical data structure, and being adapted to write data to a data group associated with the respective entity*** (e.g., see use of “connectors” as discussed in [0006], [0007], [0009], [0025] to [0027], and throughout the reference).

Claim 88 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 9 discussed hereinabove.

For claim 10, Kusterer further teaches ***a method according to claim 9, wherein processing said model comprises:***

selecting one or more objects within said model;

determining one or more writers to be invoked to write data from the or each object to said hierarchical data structure; and

invoking the or each writer to write data to said hierarchical data structure (e.g., see use of “connectors” as discussed in [0006], [0007], [0009], [0025] to [0027], and throughout the reference).

Art Unit: 2179

Claim 89 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 10 discussed hereinabove.

For claim 11, Kusterer further teaches ***a method according to claim 10, further comprising:***

determining from said at least one writer at least one further object within said model, and processing said further object (e.g., see use of “connectors” as discussed in [0006], [0007], [0009], [0025] to [0027], and throughout the reference).

Claim 90 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 11 discussed hereinabove.

For claim 12, Kusterer further teaches ***a method according to claim 10, further comprising:***

identifying a further writer configured to identify an entity within said hierarchical data structure to which data is to be written (e.g., see use of “connectors” as discussed in [0006], [0007], [0009], [0025] to [0027], and throughout the reference).

Claim 91 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 12 discussed hereinabove.

For claim 13, Kusterer further teaches ***a method according to claim 12, wherein said identifying an entity comprises:***

attempting to locate an entity within said hierarchical data structure to which data should be written; and

if said attempt is unsuccessful, creating an appropriate entity (e.g., see use of “connectors” as discussed in [0006], [0007], [0009], [0025] to [0027], and throughout the reference).

Claim 92 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 13 discussed hereinabove.

For claim 14, Kusterer further teaches ***a method according to claim 9, wherein each writer is a writer object which is an instance of a respective Java writer class*** (e.g., see use of “connectors” as discussed in [0006], [0007], [0009], [0025] to [0027], and throughout the reference).

Claim 93 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 14 discussed hereinabove.

For claim 15, Kusterer further teaches ***a method according to claim 14, wherein each writer class has a corresponding writer factory class*** (e.g., see use of “connectors” as discussed in [0006], [0007], [0009], [0025] to [0027], and throughout the reference).

Claim 94 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 15 discussed hereinabove.

For claim 16, Kusterer further teaches ***a method according to claim 15, further comprising: registering each writer factory class with a writer lookup object; providing details of the or each object to be processed to said writer lookup object; and identifying one or more factory classes which should be used to create writer objects*** (e.g., see use of “connectors” as discussed in [0006], [0007], [0009], [0025] to [0027], and throughout the reference).

Claim 95 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 16 discussed hereinabove.

For claim 17, Kusterer teaches ***a method of generating model data representing a model of a composite user interface comprising a plurality of user interface elements provided by at least one source application, the method comprising:***

modelling at least part of a user interface provided by the or each source application (see Fig. 2, Fig. 3, Fig. 6 and Fig. 7); ***and***

modelling relationships between the at least part of the user interface provided by the or each source application and the composite user interface (e.g., see Abstract, [0006], [0007], [0009], [0024], and [0026]).

For claim 18, Kusterer further teaches ***a method according to claim 17, wherein the model is adapted for use in generating a composite application*** (e.g., see Abstract, [0006], [0007], [0009], [0024], and [0026]).

For claim 19, Kusterer further teaches **a method according to claim 17, wherein modelling at least part of the user interface provided by the or each source application comprises:**

defining a plurality of source flow items each comprising a specified source user interface page provided by a source application; and

defining relationships between said plurality of source flow items (e.g., see Fig. 3, Fig. 6 and Fig. 7, wherein individual pages from applications can be interpreted as the source flow items).

For claim 20, Kusterer further teaches **a method according to claim 19, wherein modelling at least part of the user interface provided by the or each source application further comprises:**

defining at least one page element within each specified source user interface page (e.g., defining a link or a URL. See [0007], [0023]).

For claim 21, Kusterer further teaches **a method according to claim 19, wherein modelling at least part of the user interface provided by the or each source application further comprises: defining at least one flow control condition; associating a flow control condition with at least one of said plurality of source flow items** (see [0023]).

For claim 22, Kusterer further teaches ***a method according to claim 19, wherein modelling at least part of the user interface provided by the or each source application further comprises: defining request parameters used to obtain each specified source user interface page*** (e.g., pages are obtained using links or URLs. See [0023], [0031], [0051], and [0059]).

For claim 23, Kusterer further teaches ***a method according to claim 19, wherein modelling at least part of the user interface provided by the or each source application further comprises: defining at least one rule for each specified source user interface page which can be applied to enable recognition of the associated specified source user interface page*** (e.g., pages are recognized using links or URLs. See [0023], [0031], [0051], and [0059]).

For claim 24, Kusterer further teaches ***a method according to claim 23, wherein the or each rule is specified using a regular expression, or a path expression*** (e.g., a link or URL apparently contains a path expression).

For claim 25, Kusterer further teaches ***a method according to claim 17, wherein modelling at least part of the user interface provided by the or each***

Art Unit: 2179

source application further comprises: creating a plurality of objects which are instances of classes defined in an object oriented programming language (e.g., see Table 1 to Table 3).

For claim 26, Kusterer further teaches ***a method according to claim 17, wherein modelling relationships between the at least part of the user interface provided by the or each source application and the composite user interface comprises: combining at least part of a plurality of source application models*** (see Fig. 6).

For claim 27, Kusterer further teaches ***a method according to claim 17, further comprising: defining a plurality of composite flow items each comprising a specified user interface page; and defining relationships between said plurality of composite flow items*** (see Fig. 6 and Fig. 7).

For claim 28, Kusterer further teaches ***a method according to claim 19, further comprising: defining a plurality of composite flow items each comprising a specified user interface page; and defining relationships between said plurality of composite flow items, wherein at least one composite flow item is a source flow***

item, and said specified user interface page is a specified source user interface page (see Fig. 6 and Fig. 7).

For claim 29, Kusterer further teaches ***a method according to claim 27, wherein at least one specified user interface page is a composite user interface page*** (see Fig. 7).

For claim 30, Kusterer further teaches ***a method according to claim 20, wherein at least one specified user interface page is a composite user interface page, the method further comprising: modelling manipulations which are applied to said at least one page element within a specified source user interface page to create said composite user interface page*** (e.g., see Fig. 7 wherein the pages accessed is a composite source application page and the elements of the page is manipulated within the unified interface of Fig. 7 similar to the manipulation in the source application).

For claim 31, Kusterer further teaches ***a method according to claim 30, further comprising: specifying an ordered plurality of manipulations to be carried out to create said composite user interface page*** (e.g., displaying the composite user

Art Unit: 2179

interface page of Fig. 7 using software instruction executed in a specified order by the processor).

For claim 32, Kusterer further teaches ***a method according to claim 17, further comprising modelling at least one further user interface element to be included in the composite user interface*** (see Fig. 6 and Fig. 7, which shows modeling an arbitrary number of source application's user interface elements in the composite user interface).

Claims 33-47 recite similar limitations as claims 1-16 respectively, and therefore rejected under similar rationale as discussed in the rejections of claims 1-16 hereinabove.

Claims 50-79 is directed to an apparatus implementing the method of claim 17-47 in means plus function language. Use of the "means plus function" language in drafting these claims raises rebuttable presumption that Applicants intend to invoke 35 USC § 112, sixth paragraph. As such, the claims have been interpreted to invoke 35 USC § 112, sixth paragraph. The specification mentions, "Creation of the model is effected using application software which provides a graphical user interface (GUI)." See page 81 paragraph 2. Therefore, in the broadest reasonable interpretation, the

Art Unit: 2179

means for generating model data as recited in the independent claim 50 can be interpreted as software. Since Kusterer also uses software to generate his unified user interface, it follows that Kusterer anticipates the claimed limitations recited using means plus function. The various means recited in the dependent claims are likewise interpreted in the broadest reasonable interpretation to refer to software and thus anticipated by Kusterer.

Independent claim 96 recites:

A computer apparatus for generating a composite user interface for communication with a plurality of source applications, the apparatus comprising:

modelling means (i.e., “means” interpreted as software) ***adapted to generate model data representing a model of said composite user interface in response to user input;***

storage means (i.e., “means” interpreted as software storing in hierarchical form) ***for storing said model;***

generating means (i.e., “means” interpreted as software) ***for reading said model from said storage means, and generating a configuration data structure*** (i.e., the configuration data structure is interpreted as object structures used to create a unified interface created from class definitions);

Art Unit: 2179

receiving means (i.e., “means” interpreted as software) ***adapted to receive a request from a composite user interface;***

generating means (i.e., “means” interpreted as software) ***for generating a source application request to at least one of said source application in response to said request, in accordance with data stored in said configuration data structure; and***

transmitting means (i.e., “means” interpreted as software) ***for transmitting said source application request to said at least one of said source applications.***

Kusterer teaches all the above limitations of the claim as already discussed in the rejection of claim 1 hereinabove. Therefore, this claim is also rejected under the same rationale as claim 1 discussed in detail hereinabove.

Independent claim 97 recites:

A method for modelling and generating a composite user interface comprising user interface elements provided by at least one source application comprising:

generating a source application model for each of the at least one source applications;

generating a composite application model using the or each source application model; and

processing said composite application model to generate rules for communication between said composite application and the or each source application.

This claim recites similar limitations as claim 17 except for the limitation reciting “*generating a source application model for each of the at least one source applications*”. Kusterer teaches generating source application models for each of the source applications as source hierarchies as illustrated in Fig. 6 and also discussed in [0004], [0016], and [0010] and throughout the reference. Therefore, this claim is also rejected under the same rationale as discussed in the rejection of claim 17 hereinabove.

For claim 110 Kusterer teaches ***a method for generating a composite user interface*** (e.g., a portal interface as illustrated in Fig. 5) ***comprising a plurality of user interface elements provided by at least one source application*** (e.g., as illustrated in Fig. 7), ***the method comprising selecting said composite user interface from a plurality of predefined composite user interfaces on the basis of at least one predefined parameter*** (e.g., in the basis of user's role. See [0005], [0010], [0037], and [0040]).

Claim 119, 128, and 129 are rejected under the same rationale as claim 110 over Kusterer as discussed hereinabove.

For claim 114, Kusterer further teaches **a method according to claim 110, further comprising:**

receiving at least one request message generated by said composite user interface (e.g., a user's selection event in the unified user interface requesting a resource from a source application);

producing at least one further message in response to said request message (e.g., a message generated by Applications Connectors to be sent to the appropriate application associated with the interface element selected by the user); **and**

forwarding said at least one further message to one of said at least one source applications (e.g., the Application Connector forwards the request message to the application for processing. See [0009], [0024], [0045] and throughout the reference).

Claim 123 is also rejected under the same rationale as claim 114 over Kusterer as discussed hereinabove.

Claims 98-100, 102-107, 109-111, 114, 118-120, 123, and 127-129 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gangopadhyay (US 2002/0184402 A1).

For claim 98, Gangopadhyay teaches *a method for providing a composite user interface comprising a plurality of user interface elements provided by at least one source application* (e.g., providing a user interface as shown in Table 2), *the method comprising:*

monitoring operation of the composite user interface to obtain management data (e.g., monitoring the interface to obtain user selection data, i.e., interpreted as management data, since the user selection data is used to manage changes made to the interface).

For claim 99, Gangopadhyay further teaches *a method according to claim 98, further comprising modifying said composite user interface in response to said management data* (e.g., cancelling an event and thereby updating the workflow interface based on the cancelled event. See [0118] to [0121]).

For claim 100, Gangopadhyay further teaches ***a method according to claim 99, wherein said modifying comprises deleting some of said plurality of user interface elements from said composite user interface*** (see [0121]).

For claim 102, Gangopadhyay further teaches ***a method according to claim 98, further comprising: receiving at least one request message generated by said composite user interface; producing at least one further message in response to said request message; and forwarding said at least one further message to one of said at least one source applications*** (e.g., notifying participants of an event upon cancellation of the event as discussed in [0043]).

Claims 103 (a data carrier), 104 (a computer apparatus), and 105 (an apparatus) are directed to the same invention of claim 98 in different form (i.e., subject matter). These forms are either implicitly or explicitly taught by the Gangopadhyay reference. Regarding claim 105, use of the “means plus function” language in drafting the claim raises rebuttable presumption that Applicants intend to invoke 35 USC § 112, sixth paragraph. As such, the claim has been interpreted to invoke 35 USC § 112, sixth paragraph. The specification mentions the “monitoring means” as a software module (see paragraph 4 in page 94). Gangopadhyay also uses software module for monitoring user input. Therefore, these claims are also rejected under similar rationale as claim 98. Dependent claims 106-107, and 109 recite similar limitations as claims 99-100, and 102

Art Unit: 2179

respectively. Therefore, these claims are rejected under similar rationale as claims 99-100, and 102 respectively as discussed in detail hereinabove.

For claim 110, Gangopadhyay teaches **a method for generating a composite user interface** (e.g., a Personal Workflow with associated services as illustrated in Table 2) **comprising a plurality of user interface elements provided by at least one source application** (e.g., the Services as illustrated in Table 2), **the method comprising selecting said composite user interface from a plurality of predefined composite user interfaces on the basis of at least one predefined parameter** (e.g., since the Personal Workflow is a series of potential or planned events listed in a time ordered fashion and may take the form of a business traveler's Appointment Calendar, it is implicit in the reference that a particular Personal Workflow can be chosen by the user based on date or time from the calendar).

For claim 111, Gangopadhyay further teaches **a method according to claim 110, wherein said at least one predefined parameter comprises a parameter relating to at least one of time of day and date** (as already discussed in the rejection of claim 110 hereinabove).

For claim 114, Gangopadhyay further teaches **a method according to claim 110, further comprising:**

receiving at least one request message generated by said composite user interface;

producing at least one further message in response to said request message; and

forwarding said at least one further message to one of said at least one source applications (e.g., see Context Server's Processing of a Request for Application Services as discussed in section 7.3.4. See [0108] to [0116]).

For claim 118, Gangopadhyay further teaches **a method according to claim 110, wherein at least two of said plurality of predefined composite user interfaces comprise different source user interface elements** (e.g., apparently, two different Personal Workflow interface will show different user interface elements).

Independent claims 119 (an apparatus), 128 (a data carrier) and 129 (a computer) are directed to the same invention of claim 110 in different form (i.e., subject matter). Therefore, these forms are either implicitly or explicitly taught by the Gangopadhyay reference. Regarding claim 119, use of the "means plus function" language in drafting the claim raises rebuttable presumption that Applicants intend to

Art Unit: 2179

invoke 35 USC § 112, sixth paragraph. As such, the claim has been interpreted to invoke 35 USC § 112, sixth paragraph. The “means” for storing and the “means” for selecting can reasonably be interpreted as “software” in light of the specification, thus anticipated by Gangopadhyay reference. Dependent claims 120, 123, and 127 recite similar limitations as claims 111, 114, and 118 respectively. Therefore these claims are rejected under similar rationale as discussed in the rejection of claims 111, 114, and 118 respectively hereinabove.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 101 and 108 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gangopadhyay.

For claim 101, Gangopadhyay teaches all the limitations of the claim as recited in claim 98, except the limitation reciting ***further comprising producing data representing usage patterns of said composite user interface using said management data***. However, the Examiner takes official notice that it was well-known in the art to monitor user's usage of an interface to produce usage data in order to determine usage pattern and provide customized user interface based on such usage pattern. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Personal Workflow interface as taught in Gangopadhyay to provide customized messages, advertisements or other user interface elements based on usage pattern as claimed. Such modification would have been the result not of novelty but of ordinary skill in the art.

Claim 108 is rejected under similar rationale as claim 101 discussed in detail hereinabove.

Claims 112-113, 115-117, 121-122, and 124-126 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kusterer.

For claims 112-113 and 115-117, the Examiner takes official notice that the limitations recited in these claims (e.g., selecting composite user interface based on a parameter relating to usage statistics as recited in claim 112, and selecting composite user interface based on a parameter relating to a marketing campaign as recited in claim 113, pre-rendering a portal page when only the mandatory elements are received and while waiting for the non-mandatory elements as recited in claim 115, having identical source user interface elements as recited in claim 116, and having different mandatory user interface elements as recited in claim 117) were well-known in the art at the time of the invention. For example, it was well-known to provide different portal interface to a user based on usage statistics or based on different marketing campaign as recited in claims 112 and 113 respectively. It is also well-known to pre-render a web-page when some essential items have been retrieved over the network and some non-essential items are not yet received as recited in claim 115. Therefore, it would have been part of the ordinary capabilities of a person skilled in the art to implement these techniques in the portal interface taught by Kusterer and thereby arrive at the present invention. Such modifications would have been the result not of innovation but of ordinary skill and common sense.

Claims 121-122 and 124-126 recite similar limitations as claims 112-113 and 115-117 respectively and therefore rejected under the same rationale discussed hereinabove.

Relevant Prior Art

Following is a list of prior art references that are considered relevant but not relied upon in the rejections above: Kojima et al. (US 2003/0220969 A1), Elien et al. (US 2005/0114378, Khalfay et al. (US 2002/0063734 A1), Goodman et al. (US 2004/0199896 A1), Briggs (US 6,397,384 B1).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to RASHEDUL HASSAN whose telephone number is (571)272-9481. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30AM - 4PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on 571-272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

Art Unit: 2179

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Rashedul Hassan/
Examiner, Art Unit 2179

/Weilun Lo/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2179